



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/563,949

05/11/2006

Thorsten Bendel

Y05Y013

3568

35910 7590 02/14/2008

Omori & Yaguchi USA, LLC

8 Penn Center

1628 John F. Kennedy Blvd

Suite 1300

Philadelphia, PA 19103

EXAMINER

MERLINO, ALYSON MARIE

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3673

MAIL DATE

DELIVERY MODE

02/14/2008

PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/563,949	<b>Applicant(s)</b> BENDEL, THORSTEN	
	<b>Examiner</b> ALYSON M. MERLINO	<b>Art Unit</b> 3673	

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

- (1) ALYSON M. MERLINO. (3) Konomi Takeshita.  
 (2) Carlos Lugo. (4) \_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 06 February 2008.

Type: a) ☒ Telephonic b) ☐ Video Conference  
 c) ☐ Personal [copy given to: 1) ☐ applicant 2) ☐ applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) ☐ Yes e) ☒ No.  
 If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 10.

Identification of prior art discussed: Nass et al. (WO 3018939 A1) and Fukumoto (5020838).

Agreement with respect to the claims f) ☐ was reached. g) ☐ was not reached. h) ☒ N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The examiner would like to note that the rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 in view of Nass et al. was under 35 U.S.C. 102(b), and the rejection of claim 12 under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, should have been claim 10 not claim 12. Applicant's representative thoroughly discussed the rejection of claims 1 and 3-10 in view of Nass et al. and the rejection of claims 1, 4-6, and 9 in view of Fukumoto.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Carlos Lugo/  
 Primary Examiner, Art Unit 3673

Examiner Note: You must sign this form unless it is an  
 Attachment to a signed Office action.

Examiner's signature, if required